IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

NICHOLAS DIFLORIO : CIVIL ACTION

:

V.

NO. 11-4405

SCOTT KLECKNER, et al.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 6th day of March, 2012, upon consideration of Defendant Aramark Sports, LLC's ("Aramark") Motion for Summary Judgment (Document No. 18), the plaintiff's response and the defendant's reply, it is **ORDERED** that the motion is **GRANTED IN PART** and **DENIED IN PART**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED as follows:

- 1. To the extent the motion seeks judgment in favor of the defendant Aramark on the plaintiff's discrimination claim under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as amended, it is **GRANTED**;
- 2. To the extent the motion seeks judgment in favor of the defendant Aramark on the plaintiff's retaliation claim, it is **DENIED**.

/s/ Timothy J. Savage TIMOTHY J. SAVAGE, J.